


REMARKS

Claims 3-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MaWhinney. In the Advisory Action dated April 1, 2004, the Examiner considered the reagent containers on the carousel to meet the recited liquid dispensers. Although the undersigned submits that the dispensers of MaWhinney would be the fixed inlet and outlet pipes of Fig. 2 and valve block of Fig. 3, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 3 and 11 have been amended to more explicitly distinguish MaWhinney. In particular, it is now recited that the dispenser includes an orifice in which liquid drops into the cavity, and it is that orifice which moves relative to the slide housing. In MaWhinney, there is no orifice from which liquid drops into the slide housing. Liquid is pumped through an orifice at the end of an inlet pipe in Fig. 2, but it does not drop it into the cavity of the slide housing. Further, the orifice in Fig. 2 does not move relative to the slide housing. Accordingly, MaWhinney does not suggest an orifice of a liquid dispenser from which liquid drops into the cavity and which moves relative to the slide housing as required in each of claims 3 and 11. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
James M. Smith
Registration No. 28,043
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 